



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,450	02/23/2002	Jian Zhu	Li 25	8324
570	7590	03/09/2006	EXAMINER	
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P.			MERED, HABTE	
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE			ART UNIT	
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200			PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			2662	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6/K

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/082,450	ZHU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Habte Mered	2662	

**All Participants:**

(1) Habte Mered.

(2) Louis Sickles II (Applicant's Attorney)I.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 22 February 2006

**Time:** 2:00 PM

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
N/A

Claims discussed:  
N/A


Prior art documents discussed:  
N/A

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 HASSAN KIZOU  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Applicant's Attorney initially brought to the Examiner's attention that the Office Action mailed on 11/29/05 did not address the claims in the preliminary amendment filed on 05/13/02. The Applicant's Attorney has also previously faxed a copy of the return postcard, dated 05/13/02 with the stamp of OIPE (Office of Initial Patent Examination), which indicated a preliminary amendment was filed. The Examiner indicated to the Applicant's Attorney in this phone interview that the preliminary amendment was not entered in the system and consequently only the original claims were examined. In view of the fact that the preliminary amendment was not entered in the system the Examiner in this phone conversation has informed the Applicant's Attorney that the Office Action mailed on 11/29/2005 has been vacated. Since Applicant's Attorney has agreed to refile the preliminary amendment, a new action addressing the preliminary amendment is forthcoming.